

**Notes Stakeholder Review ICANN 2011-2013 Strategic Plan Telephone
Conference**
10 November 2010

Attendees

Lesley Cowley, .uk
Sabine Dolderer, .de
Byron Holland, .ca
Staffan Johnsson, .se
Cathryn Reynolds, .ca
Peter Van Roste, CENTR

Staff

Bart Boswinkel
David Olive
Kurt Pritz
Wendy Profit
Gabiella Schitteck

Apologies

Roelof Meijer, .nl
Debbie Monahan, .nz
Mathieu Weill, .fr

- *Kurt Pritz* presented slides to the group where former strategic goals were listed together with the amended version of the same goal. He confirmed that this year's Strategic Plan would be a "dusting off" of the previous year's plan. A more thorough examination of the plan is anticipated to happen every three years.

Kurt underlined that the slides were not the final plan, but that he was looking for the reactions and input from the community.

The slides will be sent to the SOP Working Group within 24 hours. An updated version, taking the received input into account and showing tracked changes, will be sent to the group in the next few days. A version, which may be distributed to the ccTLD community will also be sent to the group.

The Strategic Plan is anticipated to be posted in the beginning of the week 15-19 November 2010. The community - and SOP Working Group members in particular, will then be asked to provide input. A public consultation on the plan will be held in Cartagena and unless there are major issues from the community, the ICANN Board will be asked to sign it off at the Cartagena meeting.

- It was asked whether the ICANN Board potentially would sign off on a "Proposed" Plan, which would have the possibility to be reiterated, if needed. It

was pointed out that although the community might agree with the strategic goals of the proposed plan, these might have to change when the operational plan is published, possibly identifying lacking ICANN and Community resources.

Kurt confirmed this.

- It was pointed out that it would be helpful if the Strategic plan could have a clear timeline for all strategic elements, so that ICANN can be held accountable.

Kurt agreed.

- It was asked whether there was any mapping or process provided on whether the current plan had been altered and corrected as a result of feedback received to the previous plan.

Kurt replied that it had been amended according to input that staff had given on what the community had expressed the strategic goals should be.

Following items presented on the slides the slides were highlighted by the participants:

- **DNS-CERT:** The participants were in agreement that it was not appropriate to have this mentioned in the plan, as there are still discussions ongoing in the community whether a DNSCERT is necessary.

Kurt replied that the general community feedback on this topic seemed to be identical and that the language therefore would be amended, rather mentioning “stability and security” solutions.

- **DNSSEC:** It was questioned whether the terminology, saying that ICANN should work towards a “broad and full adoption of DNSSEC” was suitable, as the market is not clearly asking for DNSSEC.

It was agreed that the terminology should be changed.

- **RPKI Deployment:** Clarification on the meaning was sought.

Kurt will return to the group with clarification per email.

- **Training of ccTLDs in Developing Countries:** It was felt that this description was patronising and that ccTLDs from developing nations should not be singled out in such a manner in the Strategic Plan. It was pointed out that many registries, especially several new gTLD registries, would also need training and it was therefore suggested to re-name the goal to “Registry training”.

Furthermore, it was felt that it is questionable whether the training exercise should be mentioned as a core strategic objective, as it would rather fit in on a lower level in the plan, alternatively as an item in the Operational Plan.

Kurt noted the concerns.

- **More Regional TLDs:** It was asked what the objective behind this item was. There was no understanding why ICANN would like to isolate one particular type of TLDs as a key strategic goal and why it needed to be in the Strategic Plan.

Kurt explained that the thought behind the wording was to improve global participation.

It was pointed out that in this case, not only the wording for this was inappropriate and confusing, but that this goal was already covered in the bullet points mentioning “everyone connected” and “New gTLDs, including IDNs”. Alternatively, it was suggested to use other wording for this, such as “More participation where participation is lacking”, to avoid confusion.

Kurt agreed on the proposed solution.

- **Regional Expansion:** An explanation of the thought behind this wording was requested.

Kurt noted that this expression probably would be taken down, as other community members had also criticised it.

- **IDN Protocols:** It was asked whether ICANN was aware that changing “IDNs” into “IDN Protocols” would mean it includes all IDN applications available, not only those for DNS use.

Kurt replied that ICANN was aware of this change and that it was used because it would be necessary for working towards an adoption of a protocol in all DNS applications.

- **Staff International Plan:** an explanation of the meaning of this was requested.

Kurt explained that it meant that ICANN would focus on recruiting people from different geographies and having people from the whole world involved in ICANN.

It was pointed out that the plan should also say something about staff retention and engagement, as the community is concerned about ICANN’s staff turnover.

This was noted.

- **IANA Root Zone Management:** Clarification of what that means was sought.

It was explained that it is the automation of the IANA function.

- **Key Committee Participation:** Clarification on what that means was sought.

Kurt was unsure and would seek clarification.

- **More constructive and mutually respectful Internet Governance:** The group reacted strongly to this formulation, as it was felt that depending on which

perspective one reads it from, it would either sound extremely submissive, or very aggressive.

It was suggested that possible language that would be understood by all could include the notion of “enhanced cooperation”, rather than the current phraseology.

It was advised that ICANN should rather concentrate on presenting its strengths (an understanding of the underlying technology, knowledge and insight in studies), rather than talking about public interest issues.

The feedback was noted.

- **Website improvements:** It was felt that, although a welcome initiative, “website improvements” would rather fit in the Operational Plan, alternatively under the “Communication & Participation” section.